



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,858	07/09/2003	Cheryl L. Panasik	14209	9978
7590 07/08/2004			EXAMINER	
LISA M. SOLTIS ILLINOIS TOOL WORKS INC. 3600 WEST LAKE AVENUE GLENVIEW, IL 60025			THOMAS, DAVID B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/615,858	Applicant(s) PANASIK, CHERYL L <i>LCN</i>	
	Examiner David B. Thomas	Art Unit 3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/9/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capelle (2,917,954), Chen (6,742,421 or 6,622,597), Cruz et al. (5,431,075), or Lin (6,679,142).

Capelle ('954), Chen ('421 or '597), Cruz et al. ('075), or Lin ('142) each disclose a tool having a screwdriver bit having a driver portion at one end and a sleeve engaging portion at the other end, each disclosing the bit except for the specific dimensions as presently claimed. However, regarding the specific dimensions, it appears that the applicant is attempting to define the dimensions of the bit based upon a particular intended application of the tool, and as such, the examiner, respectfully, contends that changing the size and/or shape of a particular tool based upon its intended application would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, and as such, a recitation of relative dimensions are not sufficient to patentably distinguish the claimed device over the prior art devices. *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (Claims directed to a lumber package "of appreciable size and weight requiring handling by a lift truck" where held unpatentable over prior art lumber packages which could be lifted by hand because limitations relating to the size of the package were not sufficient to patentably distinguish over the prior art.); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ

Art Unit: 3723

143 (CCPA 1976) ("mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled." 531 F.2d at 1053, 189 USPQ at 148.). In *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fruhm (6,352,011), Li (6,363,819), or Liou (6,725,749), in view of Pool et al. (5,555,781).

Fruhm ('011), Li ('819), or Liou ('749) each disclose a tool with a bit having a driver portion, a sleeve engaging portion, and a sleeve having a hexagonal opening and a detent, the sleeve engaging portion of the bit being hexagonal and having a recess for receiving the detent, and, as such, disclose the claimed invention except for the specific dimensions, or the particular material. The examiner, in paragraph 2 above, has addressed the issue of the obviousness of changing the size of the bit. Pool et al. ('781) teach making a driver bit from steel suitable for fasteners is known to persons of ordinary skill in the art, and specifically teach a bit member (fabricated from an S2 with additional carbon tool steel austempered and having a Rockwell C hardness of 59-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the tool bit of Fruhm ('011), Li ('819), or Liou

Art Unit: 3723

('749) by altering the specific dimensions of the bit for a particular application of the tool, and by constructing the bit from a particular material, such as the steel as taught by Pool et al. ('781), wherein the choice of material suitable for driving fasteners is known to persons of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Anderson et al., Hu, and Postle each disclose a tool having a driver bit wherein the driving portion of the shank of the bit has a reduced diameter relative to the remaining diameter of the shank.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David B. Thomas whose telephone number is (703) 308-4250. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-4 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David B Thomas can be reached on (703) 308-4250. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3723

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



dbt



David B. Thomas
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3723